



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

VENDOR AND PURCHASER—SALE IN GROSS—FRAUD.—Complainants contracted to sell defendants, “all that certain vein or stratum of coal known as the Pittsburg vein, etc., underlying a certain tract and parcel of land containing about 65 acres, be the same more or less,” upon a consideration of \$25,200. Pursuant to this executory contract a deed was made of “all that certain vein or stratum of coal known as the Pittsburg vein of coal, said to be about sixty-five acres, within, upon and underlying that certain tract of land situate.” Subsequent to the contract and before the delivery of the deed survey by the defendants’ agents showed a deficiency of 26.32 acres of coal in the tract conveyed. The deed reserved a lien securing a note of \$12,500, given in part payment of the purchase price. In this action to sell the coal, subjecting its proceeds to the payment of the note, the deficiency was pleaded. *Held*, the sale was of the coal in gross, and complainants should have judgment for the full amount of the note. *Cork et ux. v. Cook et al.* (1904), — W. Va. —, 48 S. E. Rep. 757.

The use of, “said to be about sixty-five acres,” in the deed is equivalent in effect to, “more or less.” Both are only approximations. And the defendants’ conduct in ordering a survey of the tract prior to their acceptance of the deed indicates that complainants’ representations, even though false, were not relied on. For fraud which does not mislead is not actionable. 14 AM. & ENG. ENCYC. OF LAW 106 and cases there cited. For the general principles governing the effect of a description of land in a conveyance with an estimate of quantity (of acres) see 1 SUGDEN ON VENDORS 489 and pages following. Courts of chancery will not interfere to relieve the purchaser when land is sold in gross or by boundaries, the words, “more or less,” being included upon deliberation, when neither party knows the exact quantity of land conveyed, and it subsequently develops that the quantity is less than the parties supposed, no fraud or intentional misrepresentation appearing. *Bennett & Williams v. Marvin*, 8 Paige 311, 316; *Stebbins v. Eddy*, 4 Mason 414. But a conveyance of land in gross, although the words, “more or less,” are inserted, will not relieve the vendor from liability for a deficiency, except that due to small errors, unless it appear that the vendee purchased at his own risk. *Triplett v. Allen et al.*, 26 Gratt. 721. And it is held that the enumeration of quantity after a description of property is mere surplusage and not controlling. *Mann v. Pearson*, 2 Johns. 37. If the false representations of the vendor induced the purchase, it matters nothing that the sale was in gross rather than by the acre. *Thomas v. Beebe*, 25 N. Y. 244.

WILLS—DOCTRINE OF ELECTION.—Testator devised to his wife a life estate only in property owned by her in fee simple, and gave the remainder to his son. He further imposed a charge of \$298 against the life interest, but bequeathed the wife personally valued at \$100. The statute would have provided \$300 as her year’s portion. *Held*, that by taking out letters of administration *cum testamento annexo* the widow elected to assume all the burdens imposed by the will. *Tripp v. Nobles* (1904), — N. C. —, 48 S. E. Rep. 675.

A distinction is to be noted between those cases where the election is against being bound by the provisions of the will, and those in favor of it.